DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 082 730 JC 730 238

AUTHOR	Korim, Andrew S.
TITLE	Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D.C.; American Bar Association, Washington, D.C. Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services.
SPONS AGENCY	Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Dept. of Justice), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Aug 73
NOTE	70p.; LEAA Grant 71-DF-1096
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	Associate Degrees; *Community Colleges; Educational Certificates; *Inservice Education; Job Training; Law Enforcement; *Police; Post Secondary Education; Program Improvement; *Staff Improvement; Standards

ABSTRACT

This report reflects the issues and concerns identified in a joint project of the AACJC and the ABA Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. The activities of the project consisted on State-level meetings, field visits, surveys, and inter-regional conferences and workshops. A discussion of the correctional officer, (his characteristics, duties performed and competencies needed) serves as a base point from which implications for educational programs are identified. Conditions influencing corrections education are reviewed: the probable impact of permissive and limiting factors such as the posture of correctional agencies, the sensitivity of State criminal justice planners, priorities of funding sources, the profile of the existing correctional officer, and the internal makeup of the college. In a chapter on approaches to corrections education, several existing alternatives, which reflect the limiting and permissive factors, are analyzed. Improvements discussed at the conferences are suggested. A chapter is devoted to suggested standards for improving educational programs to prepare and upgrade correctional officers, one of the most frequent concerns of the meetings and workshops. The standards, by the very nature of the complexities of improvements in corrections education, address State planning, the career structure, incentives to line officers, curriculum matters, and legislation. (Author/KM)

ED 082738

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

IMPROVING CORRECTIONS PERSONNEL THROUGH COMMUNITY COLLEGES

A Final Report
under
LEAA Grant No. 71-DF-1096

Andrew S. Korim, Project Director
Correctional Officers Educational Program
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
Washington, D. C. 20036

in cooperation with
Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services
American Bar Association
Washington, D. C. 20036

August, 1973

JC 730 238

The findings, opinions, and conclusions expressed in this publication are solely those of the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, as Subgrantee under Grant No. 71-DF-1096, "Junior College Attainment Program for Line Correctional Personnel," and do not necessarily reflect nor can be inferred as being the official position or policy of the U. S. Department of Justice or the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, Commonwealth of Virginia. Organizations undertaking projects are encouraged to fully express their own judgement.

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

PREFACE

Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges is, at one time, both a final project report and a handbook on meeting a critical need for strengthening line personnel capabilities within the nation's correctional systems. It, therefore, serves as a program accounting to the Justice Department's Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (whose grant support made the program possible) and a blueprint for a sound educational contribution at the community college level for those correctional workers in most direct and influential contact with adult and juvenile offenders (correctional officers, custodial workers, cottage supervisors, community corrections aides, jail officers, etc.). It is not often, unfortunately, that a formal project report has this "action" and "guidance" emphasis. We are pleased that the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) has chosen this course in its final project work product.

The Correctional Officers Educational Program (COEP) has another unique aspect. This lies in its character as a joint and collaborative effort between two great national professional associations, one representing the law and the other higher education at the two-year college level, on behalf of another major and important discipline -- that of offender correction and rehabilitation. COEP was conceived and brought to life by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges working with the American Bar Association's Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services. With grant resources all too modest for its important mission, we of the American Bar Association were honored to have participated with AACJC in seeking to expand and strengthen the quantity and quality of higher education programs for the correctional line worker.

The report documents the continuing spread of two-year college education programs, thereby demonstrating achievement of the project's initial "quantitative" goal, which was to assist at the national level in a doubling of the number of such programs available to correctional workers (less than 45 when the project began in late 1971). This fall, at least 115 junior and community colleges will be offering programs designed to better prepare the correctional officer for the difficult demands of the correctional mission.

More important, however, the report articulates knowledge and experience vital to the continuation of this salutory movement. It explores the characteristics, duties, competencies, and program responses for better serving the educational needs of line officers. It examines important influences bearing upon corrections education -- the situations of correctional agencies, funding problems, integration with total criminal justice planning, etc. Approaches to strengthening correctional education are then blueprinted, ranging from nature of degree programs to appropriate division of responsibility and alternatives for program design and emphasis.

Finally, filling a much needed void, an articulated set of standards for improvement of correctional officer education has been developed. No doubt these are not, and should not be, the final word in such an important area. More specification and refinement will be needed but this endeavor will progress well as Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges lays down the challenge and the national dialogue can begin on the important subjects covered (e.g., state plans for correctional education, career opportunities to accompany educational attainment, integration of training and education, legislative support for corrections education).

Speaking for the American Bar Association's Corrections Commission, we have found our collaboration with AACJC most rewarding. True interdisciplinary teamwork is not easy to come by, particularly at the national organization level. From Project Director Andrew Korim through top AACJC executive staff, the Commission has been gratified with the energy and commitment shown in what has often been an uphill effort. Long range needs such as staff development, however basic to criminal justice reform, tend to suffer in the competition for limited resources. Yet, as Chief Justice Warren E. Burger observed not long ago in addressing a major national conference on correctional reform:

> You are well aware, but the public is not, that well-trained personnel is far more important than the bricks and mortar. "Just anybody" cannot make a sound correctional institution any more than "just anybody" can make a good parent or a good teacher. We have yet to understand that the people who operate prisons, from the lowest guard to the highest administrator, are as important in the whole scheme of an organized society as the people who teach in the schools, colleges and universities.

We are delighted, therefore, that AACJC as lead partner and grantee in this project, has "carried the flag" on behalf of line officer education so diligently and that the accumulated experience and signposts for the future have been so well laid out in this report publication -- Improving Corrections Personnel Through Community Colleges.

RICHARD J. HUGHES, Chairman
Commission on Correctional
Facilities and Services
American Bar Association

August, 1973

FOREWORD

The nation's more than 1100 community and junior colleges constitute a major resource in improving the quality of personnel working in corrections. This was the basic assumption underlying a request by the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges for a grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice. This publication reports on the efforts of the Association to expand the involvement of the vast network of community-oriented community and junior colleges in developing and improving programs to prepare and upgrade correctional line personnel.

Whether state institutions, local detention operations or community treatment facilities, it is generally believed that those persons who have the most frequent contact with offenders -- line workers -- may be improved through training and education programs in community colleges. The issues associated with an accelerated involvement of community colleges in improving correctional manpower, alternatives available, and suggested standards for improving training and education programs are discussed in this report.

The Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services of the American Bar Association served as a partner in the Association's effort. Richard J. Hughes, Daniel L. Skoler, and Arnold Hopkins were extremely resourceful from the inception of the partnership to the completion of the project. Jennifer Johnson, a Commission staff member who served as assistant project director during much of the project efforts, was primarily responsible for the research underlying the project activities. Bradley G. Carr, also of the Commission staff, gave valuable service in analyzing data collected through the project.

E. Preston Sharp and W. Donald Pointer were generous in sharing with us their personal insights as well as to give the support of the American Correctional Association to the project's activities.

Nick Pappas, who served as our liaison with the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice, provided dependable guidance throughout the life of the project. Similarly, Bruce E. Brennan, of the Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, Commonwealth of Virginia, the sponsoring agency for the LEAA grant, gave valuable assistance.

The members of the advisory committee (whose names appear elsewhere in this report) provided the project with initial impetus and continued

sustenance which proved essential to the success of the undertakings. Although many persons contributed to the overall effort, the following persons should be recognized for their particular contributions in the conferences, state planning meetings, and in assisting us to revise drafts of this report: V. Lee Bounds, Anthony J. DelPopolo, Sr., Donald F. Favreau, David Fogel, Vernon B. Fox, Robert M. Fraser, Carl Gerber, Ellis Grayson, Walter Lew, James R. Mahoney, Joann B. Morton, Harvey Perlman, Albert J. Riendeau, Salvatore G. Rotella, Robert Sheppard, J. Winston Silva, John W. Sisson, Jr., J. Allen Suver, Jo Wallach, Wilson E. Walters, Edward H. Wilson, and Roger G. Worthington.

At the Association, Dale Gaddy, Ann Maust, Richard Wilson, William Harper, William Shannon, and Gino Forchielli rendered crucial services throughout the project. Mary Yenchick served as secretary to the project.

This report is obviously the product of many people and reflects the innovative efforts of many community colleges and correctional systems in the nation. The value of the report will be measured by the extent to which it will be found useful particularly in improving the quality of correctional line personnel and generally in elevating the effectiveness of the correctional processes.

Andrew S. Korim
Project Director
Correctional Officers Educational Program
American Association of Community and Junior Colleges
August, 1973

MEMBERS OF ADVISORY COMMITTEE

Myrl E. Alexander
Director
Center for the Study of Crime,
Delinquency and Corrections
Southern Illinois University
Carbondale, Illinois

Lee G. Henderson
Director
Division of Community Colleges
Florida Department of Education
Tallahassee, Florida

Robert C. Hilson
Director
Maryland State Department
of Juvenile Services
Baltimore, Maryland

Robert Parratt
Chief Correctional Supervisor
Nebraska Penal and
Correctional Complex
Lincoln, Nebraska

Lawrence W. Pierce
Judge
United States District Court
Southern District of New York
United States Court House
New York, New York

George J. Reed
Chairman
United States Board of Parole
Washington, D. C.

J. Harry Smith
President
Essex County College
Newark, New Jersey

J. Allen Suver
Associate Dean
Bellevue Community College
Bellevue, Washington

Martha E. Wheeler
Superintendent
Ohio Reformatory for Women
Marysville, Ohio

EX-OFFICIO MEMBERS

Bruce E. Brennan
Education and Research Coordinator
Division of Justice and
Crime Prevention
Commonwealth of Virginia
Richmond, Virginia

Arnold Hopkins
Assistant Staff Director
Commission on Correctional
Facilities and Services
American Bar Association
Washington, D. C.

Nick Pappas
Law Enforcement Specialist
Law Enforcement Assistance
Administration
U. S. Department of Justice
Washington, D. C.

E. Preston Sharp
Executive Director
American Correctional Association
College Park, Maryland

Daniel L. Skoler
Staff Director
Commission on Correctional
Facilities and Services
American Bar Association
Washington, D. C.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
	A. Background	1
	B. Activities Under the Project	3
	C. Highlights of this Report	6
II.	THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER	7
	A. Characteristics of Line Officers	8
	B. Duties Performed	9
	C. Competencies Needed	10
	D. Implications for Education Programs	16
III.	FUNDAMENTAL INFLUENCES AFFECTING CORRECTIONS EDUCATION	19
	A. Posture of Correctional Agencies	19
	B. Astuteness of State Criminal Justice Planning Agency	20
	C. Priorities of Funding Sources	21
	D. Profile of Present Correctional Officers	22
	E. Characteristics of the College	23
IV.	APPROACHES TO CORRECTIONS EDUCATION	25
	A. The Single Course	27
	B. Certificate Program in Corrections	28
	C. Two-Year Associate Degree Program	28
	D. State Training Institute Integrated with Associate Degree Programs	30
	E. Human Services Emphasis	32
	F. Criminal Justice Core	33

Page

G. Division of Responsibility between Associate Degree and Baccalaureate Programs 34

H. The Multiple Core Approach 36

I. Summary 39

V. STANDARDS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION OF LINE OFFICERS IN CORRECTIONS 40

A. State Plans for Corrections Education 42

B. Educational Attainment and Career Opportunities in Corrections 44

C. Assistance to Line Officer for Participation in Education 45

D. Integration of Training and Education 47

E. Improvement of Instructional Programs 49

F. Role of Universities in Relation to Community College Corrections Programs 53

G. Legislation to Improve Corrections Education 55

H. Summary 57

REFERENCES 59

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.	Profile of Custodial Officers in Georgia	9
2.	Summary of Correctional Officer Duties	11
3.	Summary of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Skills Required for Correctional Officer Duties	12
4.	Competencies Needed by Correctional Officers	13
5.	Inventory of Community College Educational Programs in Corrections	26
6.	Certificate Program in Corrections, City Colleges of Chicago - Loop College	28
7.	Associate Degree Program in Corrections, Dutchess Community College	29
8.	The Minnesota Approach	31
9.	Associate Degree Program in Corrections with a Human Services Emphasis, College of DuPage	32
10.	Criminal Justice Core, California Community Colleges	33
11.	Associate Degree Program in Corrections Science, Northern Virginia Community College	35
12.	Multiple Core Approach to Corrections Education: Suggested Associate Degree Program	37
13.	Assistance for Educational Participation	45

I. INTRODUCTION

A. BACKGROUND

Observations made by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in 1969 included:[1]

- -- Recruitment of correctional personnel is ordinarily carried out in an uncoordinated and haphazard manner.
- -- Young people are missing from the correctional employment scene.
- -- Persons now employed in corrections entered it from a wide variety of previous employment or status.
- -- Many agencies continue to implement personnel policies which have or are being discarded by other public agencies and by private industry.
- -- There is little connection, in current practice, between educational background and the performance of particular functions.
- -- Corrections has no well-defined link to any level or discipline of the educational system.
- -- There has been considerable controversy over the kind and level of formal training required of employees who work primarily with individual offenders in their daily life situation.

Unfortunately, conditions in corrections have not changed significantly. Across the nation corrections is attracting public attention.

Headlines such as "Rioting in S.F. Jail" reflect episodes that are symptoms of a system overwhelmed by archaic practices, ill-prepared personnel, and with an astounding will to resist change.

One of the recommendations made by the Joint Commission was that two-year community colleges should expand their programs for correctional personnel.[2] Almost simultaneously with the Joint Commission efforts, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC), convened a series of regional discussions between the community colleges and the field of corrections, which culminated in the publication of Guidelines for Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges.[3] Suggestions for a plan of action intended to accelerate the establishment of certificate and associate degree programs were made. Nevertheless, the mobilization of community college resources was less than significant. From roughly two-dozen programs in 1969, the number grew to slightly more than forty programs by the spring of 1971. One might say that to almost double the effort in two years is an outstanding achievement. The magnitude of the need suggests that the growth was not significant. The fact that there are over 1100 community and junior colleges in the nation suggests that a major resource for improving corrections personnel has been under utilized.

With the above conditions as the background, the American Association of Community and Junior Colleges (AACJC) undertook a program, supported in part with funds from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice,[4] to devise ways to expand the number of certificate and associate degree programs in corrections, and accordingly, to expand the enrollments in such programs of persons

employed in corrections and students interested in embarking on a career in corrections.

The Commission on Correctional Facilities and Services of the American Bar Association (CCFS-ABA) became a partner in this undertaking. The Commission's efforts in attempting to bring reform to correctional processes are serving as an important ingredient in improving the quality of personnel working in corrections. Furthermore, the linkages of the CCFS-ABA with the practicing lawyers throughout the states provided a valuable resource to the project.

The cooperation of the American Correctional Association (ACA) and a number of other interested organizations was acquired in this effort. Over the years these organizations have spearheaded a wide range of professional activities with significant impact. These organizations were extremely helpful in this project.

The thrust of the project was to focus primarily on the line officer in corrections -- the person who is in face-to-face contact daily with the offender and thereby has significant influence on the correctional process. The project became known as the Correctional Officers Educational Program (COEP).

B. ACTIVITIES UNDER THE PROJECT

The activities conducted under the project consisted primarily of field visitations, surveys, and conferences.

1. Meetings with Officials in Selected States. In an effort to identify the issues and concerns pertinent to improving the quality of correctional officers, meetings were held with officials in six states: New York, Minnesota, California, North Carolina, Illinois, and

Pennsylvania. Although the composition of participants at the meetings varied, the mix usually consisted of the state commissioner of corrections, training officers from correctional institutions both local and state, representatives from the state community college agencies, and community college presidents and staff members.

Although many of the issues varied from state to state, certain ones dominated discussions. The following are the primary issues that surfaced in all states:

-- What will be the characteristics of the profile of the future correctional officer?
-- What changes in education and training will be necessary to develop these characteristics in the future correctional officer?
-- What alternative forms of education and training are available to do the job?
-- How can existing correctional officers be motivated to participate in training and education programs?
-- How can new personnel be attracted to corrections?
-- How can the resources of community and junior colleges be mobilized?
-- How can state planning for education and training of correctional officers be improved?
-- What are the alternative sources of funds to finance corrections education?
-- How can legislation pertaining to the education and training of correctional officers be improved?

2. Inter-regional Conferences. The above listed issues and concerns were addressed in workshops conducted at four inter-regional conferences. The respective conferences were held as follows: Western States Conference, Salt Lake City, Utah, August 28 and 29, 1972; Central States Conference, St. Louis, Missouri, October 30 and 31, 1972; Eastern States Conference, Hartford, Connecticut, November 9 and 10, 1972; Southern States Conference, Mobile, Alabama, December 14 and 15, 1972.

The conferences were attended by one hundred and eighty-five persons from forty-four states, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, and Canada. Representation at the conferences consisted of:

-- state and local corrections administrators, training officers, and correctional officers (including jail personnel)
-- state criminal justice planning agency officials
-- state community college officials
-- state vocational education officials
-- presidents, administrators, and faculty from community and junior colleges, technical institutes, and universities
-- representatives from federal agencies: Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Bureau of Prisons, and U. S. Office of Education.

3. Surveys and Studies. During the term of the project the following research was conducted by administering questionnaires at project conferences, mail questionnaires and literature studies:

-- Inventory of Educational Programs in Community and Junior Colleges.
-- Survey of Line Officer Educational Needs.
-- Analysis of State Law Enforcement Improvement Plans Regarding Role of Two-Year Colleges in Correctional Staff Development.

-- Survey of Legislation, Regulations, and Policies Supportive of Correctional Officer Education.

C. HIGHLIGHTS OF THIS REPORT

This report reflects the issues and concerns identified in the state-level meetings and the views expressed by the participants in the workshops of the inter-regional conferences. The findings of the research serve as reference points throughout the report.

A discussion of the correctional officer (his characteristics, duties performed and competencies needed) serves as the base point from which implications for educational programs are identified.

Conditions influencing corrections education are reviewed: the probable impact of permissive and limiting factors such as the posture of correctional agencies, the sensitivity of state criminal justice planners, priorities of funding sources, the profile of the existing correctional officer, and the internal makeup of the college. In a chapter on approaches to corrections education, several existing alternatives are analyzed. The alternatives are many and reflect the limiting and permissive factors mentioned above. Improvements, as discussed at the conferences, are suggeste

One of the most frequent concerns that ran throughout all meetings and workshops was that of standards for improving educational programs to prepare and upgrade correctional officers. A chapter is devoted to suggested standards. The standards, by the very nature of the complexities of improvements in corrections education, address state planning, the career structure, incentives to line officers, curriculum matters, and legislation. The suggested standards are intended to pull together all principals essential to improved corrections education (and in turn to an improved correctional process) into a unified coalition.

II. THE CORRECTIONAL OFFICER

> All pre-service and in-service training should include extensive programs in human relations. All employees must be informed of their obligation to treat all inmates with equal dignity and courtesy. Where significant numbers of inmates have cultural or linguistic behavior patterns differing from the prevailing culture in the institution or system, all personnel should be familiarized with those patterns. As any inability to communicate between staff and inmates may lead to institutional tension or friction, training should be aimed at removing communication barriers.
> --Association of State Correctional Administrators.[5]

One of the issues encountered early in the efforts under this project centered around the profile of the line officer in corrections. What are the characteristics of correctional officers? What does the correctional officer do? What tasks are performed? What competencies are needed? What are the implications of this information for educational programs in community and junior colleges?

A search of literature made it clear that the research on the functions of the correctional officer and the competencies required to perform these functions has been meager. Interestingly, in a review of educational programs in higher education conducted by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, consultants, who were utilized by the Joint Commission to analyze the issues pertaining to improving correctional manpower, generally failed to relate the profile of the correctional officer, the tasks performed, and the competencies needed to educational programs in corrections. Further, a preoccupation with baccalaureate degree and graduate programs by the consultants was evident in papers submitted to the Joint Commission, virtually excluding associate degree level education in their discussions.[6]

The discussion that follows in this chapter is based on the findings of the literature search and the workshop proceedings at conferences.

A. CHARACTERISTICS OF LINE OFFICERS

The profile of line workers in corrections, as determined by the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, consists of the following characteristics:[7]

-- 79% working in adult institutions receive annual salaries of $8,000 or less.
-- 93% working in juvenile institutions receive annual salaries of $8,000 or less.
-- 68% have no college preparation.
-- 29% say they would not recommend corrections as a career to a young person.
-- 95% working in adult institutions are white.
-- 74% working in juvenile institutions are white.
-- 95% working in adult institutions are male.
-- 57% working in juvenile institutions are male.
-- 12% are under 30.
-- about 25% are over 50.
-- about 30% have 3 years experience or less in corrections.
-- 36% working in adult institutions have over 10 years experience in corrections.
-- 30% working in juvenile institutions have over 10 years experience in corrections.

Similarly, a 1968 study of correctional personnel in Georgia summarized the characteristics of custodial officers. It is noteworthy that

only 2.2% of the custodial officers in Georgia had some college preparation and that only .2% had graduated from college. High school graduation had been achieved by 39% (see Table 1 for a demographic profile).[8]

Table 1. Profile of Custodial Officers in Georgia

Average Age	Average Salary	Average Service	Average Education	% Hi Sch Grad Only	% Some College	% College Grad	% Prev Exp
46.9	$4,206	3.7	9.6	39.0%	2.2%	.2%	50.4%

Source: Donald D. Brewer and Carol Ann Blair, In-Service Training for Probation, Parole and Correctional Personnel: A Plan for Action, Athens, Georgia, Institute of Government, University of Georgia, February, 1968.

B. DUTIES PERFORMED

A valuable frame of reference in establishing the dimensions of the duties of the correctional officer is the general description found in Correction Officers Training Guide, published by the American Correctional Association.[9] The supervision of inmates -- the primary duty -- consists of specific tasks associated with housing, meals, personal care, visits with non-institutional personnel, recreation, and work. In many ways these tasks are no different than those performed by line personnel in other institutional settings where group confinement is a characteristic of residence -- mental institutions, nursing homes, hospitals.

The heavy emphasis on security is, however, a fundamental component in correctional officer duties that distinguishes them from the duties of line personnel working in other human services institutions.

Secondly, a significant difference of rehabilitation in corrections, in contact with other areas of human rebuilding, is the element of criminal behavior in the background of the inmate and the recidivism characteristic of so-called "rehabilitated" and released offenders.

The ACA publication identifies counseling as an important task but does not elaborate with so much detail as in the supervisory dimensions of the line officer's duties. Trends in the nation would suggest that there is considerable transition away from security and inmate supervision to counseling and guidance in matters of career development, employment opportunities upon release, pre-release diversion programs, family problems, and rights of offenders, among others. Increasingly, service functions are becoming primary responsibilities of line workers in corrections.

Table 2 summarizes the duties outlined in the ACA publication.

C. COMPETENCIES NEEDED

The ACA Correction Officers Training Guide[10] and the AACJC Guidelines for Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges[11] list competencies needed to perform the line officer functions. Tables 3 and 4 summarize the respective listings.

Through a questionnaire administered to the correctional administrators and educators from forty-four states attending inter-regional conferences conducted under the project, line officer educational needs were examined. In assessing the importance of certain skills and areas of knowledge for the line officer, respondents most frequently ranked as "very important": deviant behavior, security procedures, inmates rights, counseling skills and philosophy of corrections.

Table 2. Summary of Correctional Officer Duties

Supervises inmates in housing units.
Supervises groups of inmates assembled for chapel, for entertainment and for athletic contests.
Supervises groups of inmates during serving of meals.
Supervises groups of inmates assembled for baths and exchange of clothing.
Supervises inmates during recreational period.
Supervises work performance of inmates.
Exercises disciplinary control over inmates.
Inspects inmate's person and quarters for contraband.
Hears inmate grievances and counsels inmates.
Maintains outer perimeter security.
Supervises visits to prisoners.
Transports prisoners.
Prevents or controls fighting between inmates.
Controls and restrains inmates.
Handles emergencies.
Operates and inspects security devices.
Cares for equipment.
Escorts visitors through institution.

Source: Correction Officers Training Guide, American Correctional Association, College Park, Maryland, 1959, pp. 16-18. This listing is a summary of the duties listed in the Guide.

Table 3. Summary of Knowledge, Attitudes, and Skills Required for Correctional Officer Duties

How to make regular and irregular counts.	How to carry out visiting procedures.
How to maintain custody.	How to prevent contraband entering the institution.
How to promote orderly and sanitary living conditions.	How to enforce laws and regulations governing visitors.
How to promote socially acceptable conduct.	How to apply restraint equipment.
How to carry out the feeding of inmates.	How to transport prisoners safely.
How to preserve order and handle altercations.	How to transfer custody of prisoners.
How to prevent waste or pilferage of food.	How to instruct inmates on work methods.
How to prevent taking of utensils.	How to prepare inmate work reports.
How to control movement of inmates to and from activities.	Technical knowledge of work projects.
How to control clothing allowances.	How to count inmates on the job.
How to maintain custody.	How to organize jobs and work crews.
How to stop gambling.	How to counsel inmates regarding work habits.
How to encourage and supervise participation in hobby, library, and other activities.	How to foresee and prevent trouble developing between inmates.
How to interpret rules and regulations of institutions.	How to break up fights and apply physical control methods.
How to report infractions of rules.	How to apply self-defense methods.
How to counsel inmates.	How to assist another officer under attack.
How to search inmate's person, clothing and quarters.	How to prevent property damage.
How to recognize and find contraband items and handle them.	How to administer first-aid care.
How to offer guidance to inmates relative to their adjustment to institutional conditions and personnel problems.	How to report and help to extinguish fires.
How to operate security devices for control or custody.	How to arrest, seize, and search.
How to inspect security devices for proper operation.	How to report accidents.
How to observe outer boundary areas of institution.	How to preserve evidence and give testimony.
How to maintain alertness.	How to operate and maintain all types of equipment assigned.
How to use firearms.	How to foster good public relations.
	How to interpret institutional policies.
	How to safeguard visitors.
	How to participate in training sessions.
	How to apply instructions on the job.
	How to submit a good report.

Source: Correction Officers Training Guide, American Correctional Association, College Park, Maryland, 1959, pp. 16-18.

Table 4. Competencies Needed by Correctional Officers

Ability to understand and withstand provocative behavior without becoming punitive. Development of objectivity in accepting relationships with all clients in a nonjudgmental manner. Competence to accept an inmate or person on the caseload without personal involvement, with neither punitive nor sentimental views. On-the-job counseling techniques. Ability to say "no" -- with reasons when necessary, and to say "yes" with equal reason. Sensitivity to pathological behavior as compared with normal random behavior, sufficient to permit referral to professional staff. Ability to assess strengths of an individual, to determine what the treatment team has to build on in the treatment of the offender. Making referrals to all staff, community resources, and other specialties with some sophistication. Willingness to augment and support the therapeutic community and the therapeutic process in institution and community programs. Ability to observe and accurately record: individual behavior, group behavior, and behavior regarding organized or illicit activity. Ability to use tact in problem situations.	Ability to assess the community-reintegration model. Constructively interpret administrative decisions, actions, and procedures to inmates, probationers, and parolees. Serving as upward communicator from the inmate body to the administration and from the probation and parole caseload to the judge and field services supervisor. Maintaining discrete silence on some critical issues and "classified" information to maintain staff morale, inmate and caseload morale, and good public relations. Capability of exerting external controls on individuals who need containment with physical force or firearms when necessary without using more force than the situation actually requires. Knowing specific procedures that might be modified or elaborated in the in-service training program of the correctional agency or institution--such as classification procedure, pre-parole planning, probation and parole revocation hearings, and procedures at similar level. Knowledge of the civil and constitutional rights of prisoners and the incorporation of that knowledge into the supervisory process. Knowledge to interpret the system of justice.

Source: Vernon B. Fox, Guidelines for Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969, pp. 18-19.

Interestingly, some division between corrections personnel and educators did appear in the responses to the question. Educators considered the following more frequently to be "very important" than did correctional respondents: theories of social work, education and training opportunities for inmates, parole procedures, interview procedures and juvenile delinquency. Perhaps an explanation for the difference is that educators are seeking to structure their programs to produce the correctional officer of the future -- one whose role in the rehabilitation of the inmate population will change over time -- while the correctional representatives are looking at unmet immediate needs in corrections. Further, educators tend to be theoretically oriented while corrections personnel are oriented to practical solutions to specific situations.

Items of note are skills and areas of interest that received a relatively low rating by both groups. For example, history of penology, information on recreational rehabilitation, teaching methodology, data on social agencies and statistical information on corrections, all received low rankings in importance. Most of these areas received only a "somewhat important" rating and the last two received the largest number of "not very important."[12]

In synthesizing the competencies identified by the above studies, eight basic categories of competencies pertinent to corrections may be identified:

-- those pertaining to <u>personal conduct</u> (such as the ability to exercise discretion in discussing matters regarding inmates and staff)

-- those pertaining to effective utilization of facilities and equipment (such as the merging of concepts of psychology with the operation of control and security devices)

-- those pertaining to observation and analysis of routine and emergency conditions affecting the correctional process (such as the impact of defective facilities or inadequate living conditions on inmate conduct)

-- those pertaining to counseling and guidance (such as the capability to identify individual needs regarding occupational training, employment opportunities, family matters, and inmate rights)

-- those pertaining to referral services and community resources (such as an understanding of the purpose and scope of community agencies and volunteer groups available to assist the inmate)

-- those pertaining to influencing behavioral change and interpersonal relations (such as the capability to identify conflict situations and to apply alternatives to reduce or resolve them -- interpersonal, racial, political, social)

-- those pertaining to providing leadership in organizing inmate activities (such as organizing the use of leisure time by inmates)

-- those pertaining to the ability to understand the purpose, interpret, and implement administrative policies and

practices (such as routine and emergency security measures, work rules, and regulations on group activities).

These competencies obviously vary according to the nature of the correctional operation, but they represent minimal competencies necessary for line officers generally to perform their functions effectively. Each category represents a component of performance that correctional officers contribute in the overall treatment process.

D. IMPLICATIONS FOR EDUCATION PROGRAMS

A serious revelation that comes from an analysis of the characteristics of correctional officers, the functions performed, and the competencies needed is that correctional agencies are often staffed with inadequately prepared line workers. Because of the lack of experience and educational preparation, most correctional officers are not in an advantageous position to cope effectively with the process of preparing offenders to carry out responsible, stable and productive roles in the communities to which they will return. Many persons contend that line officers are the primary rehabilitative force in correctional systems because of the frequency of face-to-face contact between inmates and custodial personnel. All too often, an inexperienced, poorly educated correctional officer carries the burden of the challenges of rehabilitation. This burden can be an overwhelming one.

In reviewing today's level of technology in corrections -- the existing concepts and methods of rehabilitation of offenders, it is clear that a heavy dependency is placed upon the line officers. Yet, corrections is unsuccessful in drawing and holding the caliber of

individual who might close the gap between the existing technology and the many categories of offenders. Starting salaries are low. Career ladders do not provide satisfactory upward mobility in many cases. Attitudes of many correctional employees reflect these conditions.

Coupling these considerations with the fact that the level of educational attainment characteristic of line officers is low, a national commitment to the goal of one and two years of pertinent educational preparation beyond high school for line workers would change components of the profile of the officer improving significantly the quality of rehabilitative services rendered in the correctional process.

Community and junior colleges are philosophically committed and operationally capable to play a major role in bringing improvement in the quality of line personnel working in corrections; however, a number of other ingredients are needed to produce a sound program of personnel development for corrections. Legislative action is required in most states to provide the enabling conditions. Job engineering, structural changes in the career hierarchy, and improved local and state planning in the utilization of resources are among the essential components of a meaningful educational thrust. Selection standards for corrections personnel must be elevated.

On the basis of the functions performed by line personnel, the development of the eight categories of competencies, summarized above, may be considered primary needs of line workers and, in effect, serve as minimum objectives for a sound educational program to elevate the quality of personnel performing line functions. The future line workers, if prepared with these competencies, would constitute a significant

improvement over the present line workers. In one workshop conducted under the project, the participants felt strongly that the goal of educational programs for line personnel is not to educate personnel out of their present positions, but to improve qualifications to enable a better use of the line workers in the treatment process. Therefore, educational programs should reflect this position.[13]

The technology of the correctional process is undergoing change. This change reflects a number of trends such as:

-- shorter sentences for offenders
-- increased use of probation
-- expansion in the use of work release, family furloughs, and other forms of diversion
-- greater utilization of ex-offenders
-- growing emphasis in the use of half-way houses.

As the technology of the correctional process is modified, the functions of the line officer will undoubtedly change and educational programs must be modified accordingly. In fact, educational programs must draw a balance between the preparation of line personnel to meet the demands under the existing system and the anticipated demands emerging with a changing system.

III. FUNDAMENTAL INFLUENCES AFFECTING CORRECTIONS EDUCATION

A number of conditions set the limiting and permissive parameters of educational programs in community and junior colleges to prepare or upgrade correctional officers. Among these are the planning process for criminal justice as reflected in state law enforcement planning under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, program approval processes in the states, the funding patterns for corrections education, internal characteristics of the college, and the legislative mandates in the various states. Some of these influences were reviewed at workshops and conferences during the course of the project, and the following sections of this chapter reflect the observations.

A. POSTURE OF CORRECTIONAL AGENCIES

The most basic influence on correctional officer education is the posture of the correctional agencies in the area served by a community college. The extent to which officials of state and local correctional agencies support educational programs on the one hand and the degree to which they perceive the community college as a resource on the other will affect the involvement of the community college. A community college is not likely to develop a viable program without the full cooperation of the correctional agencies.

Ingredients needed by the college such as broad representation on the advisory committee, data on manpower needs in the correctional field, experienced instructors, work experience stations for pre-service students, and job placement opportunities must, by their nature, come from the correctional agencies. In-service personnel interested in

advancing themselves educationally need the cooperation of their agencies. Such matters as released time for education, scheduling of shifts, and the recognition of educational attainment are important supportive considerations in encouraging in-service personnel to improve their qualifications.

In cases where the correctional agencies do not take a positive stance regarding corrections education, a community college is not likely to have a sustaining program either for pre-service or in-service students.

B. ASTUTENESS OF STATE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING AGENCY

Under the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act, state planning became a critical factor in bringing improvements in criminal justice. The extent to which the state planning agency gives priority to corrections in state work plans will obviously have impact on the extent to which improvements in corrections are imminent. Neglect of corrections in favor of the apprehension functions of the police or the adjudication functions of the courts will undermine the likelihood of improvements in the total process.

If this reasoning is extended to training and education, similar conclusions may be reached. A preoccupation with the improvement of facilities and technology to the exclusion of improvements in the manpower of corrections will negate the effect of the investment in the hardware of the profession.

Obviously, the leverage effect of the state planning agencies on education programs in community colleges can be significant. A relatively low or a zero expenditure on manpower needs assessment and curriculum activity will have its effect on community college training

and education efforts. Needless to say, awareness by officials of state planning agencies of the manpower needs of corrections, the impact of training and education on total improvement of criminal justice, and the capabilities of the community and junior colleges are essential for success in corrections education efforts.

C. PRIORITIES OF FUNDING SOURCES

Within a given state, various sources of funds for training and education in corrections are available to community and junior colleges. The requirements specified by the funding agencies often serve as constraints upon the colleges. It is not unusual to find that curriculum design is a function of the requirements specified by a source of funds rather than a function of the needs of students. As one college representative noted in a workshop, "We have no trouble getting funds. We just do what the people with the money ask us to do." In a case of this nature, the needs of students and the corrections community become subordinate to the needs of the funding agency and of the college. One college reported that support under the Law Enforcement Education Program (LEEP) was expected to be terminated because it concentrated too heavily on the training needs of the local institution rather than meeting the requirements as specified by the administering agency. Inasmuch as LEEP provides grants and loans to students, enrollments in an educational program can drop to an unacceptable level if the incentives are denied students because of failure of the college to meet the criteria of the administering agency.

Colleges sometimes find themselves caught between the demands of different funding agencies. An example of this circumstance is the

case in which LEEP requirements must be met to enable students to receive grants and the requirements of the state vocational education agency must be met to receive program funds under the Vocational Education Amendments of 1968. Both sources of funds are critical, but the minimum conditions to be met in the educational program to receive funds may be incompatible. Although such incongruities could be eliminated by coordination between the funding agencies, colleges report with only infrequent exceptions that there is, in fact, no noticeable degree of coordination between state vocational education and criminal justice agencies that would resolve these problems.

Colleges react differently to these problems. Some use these circumstances as excuses to avoid offering corrections programs. Others attempt to negotiate compromises. Still others create their peculiar hybrid versions in responding to the manpower needs of corrections.

D. PROFILE OF PRESENT CORRECTIONAL OFFICERS

One of the factors that varies widely across the nation is the profile of the correctional officers presently employed. Not only does the profile of correctional officers -- the level of educational attainment, the entry requirements, the job descriptions, and functions performed -- vary considerably within a state between local correctional agencies and the state agency, but the variations range widely from state to state. It is fallacious to assume that correctional officers are a single homogeneous entity.

As community colleges respond to the challenge of offering programs to improve the manpower of corrections, attention must be given to the characteristics of the officers presently employed in the state and

community being served. Otherwise, the educational program will tend to be abstract, unrelated to the immediate employment and promotional opportunities, and of little practical value to the existing correctional system.

Although minimum national standards for hiring, training, education, and job performance would tend to result in a homogeneous profile for correctional officers, the conditions among the states are currently diverse and community college programs generally reflect this diversity.

E. CHARACTERISTICS OF THE COLLEGE

Community colleges respond to the manpower needs of their communities and the individual needs of students with varying degrees of receptivity, dispatch, and pertinent programming. Among the factors that may affect the response of a particular community college to the challenges of improving the quality of corrections personnel are:

- -- extent to which the college is committed to the philosophy of a comprehensive community college
- -- capacity of its resources -- funds, staff, faculty, space, etc.
- -- nature of the curriculum development and approval processes within the college
- -- extent of community participation in planning and development activities at the college
- -- proximity of the college to correctional agencies
- -- degree to which the college has experience in occupationally-oriented educational programs
- -- extent of prior involvement of college's board, staff and faculty in assisting the community to resolve social problems

-- degree of autonomy from state control enjoyed by the college.

These factors will influence the colleges' capacity to respond with programs in corrections. Indeed, all community colleges are not likely to be in a position to offer programs in corrections. The nature of educational programs -- upgrading, certificate, associate degree -- and the quality of program offerings will vary from college to college because of factors internal to the college.

IV. APPROACHES TO CORRECTIONS EDUCATION

One of the studies conducted as a part of the project was a survey of programs in corrections offered by community and junior colleges. Table 5, Inventory of Community College Educational Programs in Corrections, provides a summary of the findings on a state by state basis.

In reviewing curricula of community and junior colleges designed to prepare and upgrade correctional officers, a number of approaches are found. These approaches include:

- -- a single course pertaining to corrections
- -- courses added to other curricula such as associate degree curricula in liberal arts or police science
- -- certificate programs consisting of a module of corrections-related courses primarily designed to serve the immediate needs of persons already employed in corrections
- -- a two-year curriculum leading to an associate degree in corrections
- -- a corrections option as a part of a human services-oriented curriculum
- -- a corrections option in an associate degree curriculum consisting primarily of a criminal justice emphasis
- -- special arrangements reflecting practices of a particular state.

As noted earlier, it should be recognized that the programs offered reflect a response to local or state circumstances, sometimes developed

Table 5. Inventory of Community College Educational Programs in Corrections*

States with Positive Response	Number of Responses per Category**						
	I	II	III	IV	V	VI	VII
Alabama						1	
Arizona	1				1		1
Arkansas				1			
California	7	5		2		5	17
Colorado					1		1
Connecticut	1				2		
Delaware					1		
District of Columbia	1						
Florida	6	2			2	2	3
Georgia		3			1	2	3
Hawaii		1					
Illinois	3	2	1		4		
Iowa		2			1		2
Kansas					1		1
Kentucky	1					1	
Maryland	1	1			2		
Massachusetts					2		
Michigan	1	2			2	2	
Minnesota	1					1	
Mississippi						1	1
Missouri		1	1			1	
Montana						2	
Nevada						2	
New Jersey	1				2		2
New York	3				1	2	8
North Carolina	3	2	3	1	2	2	2
Ohio		2			6	2	1
Oklahoma					1		1
Oregon	1				1		1
Pennsylvania	3					1	2
Puerto Rico						1	
South Carolina	1						
Texas	1				1		1
Vermont	1					1	
Virginia	2	1				1	1
Washington	3				1	1	
Wisconsin					2	1	
Wyoming							1
Total	42	24	5	4	37	32	49

*Based on results of mail questionnaire conducted in spring 1972 and follow-up inquiries made in summer and fall of 1972 at conference. States not listed in this table did not give a positive response to this questionnaire.

**Keys for Columns:

I Institutions offering certificates or associate degree programs in Corrections, Criminal Justice with option in Corrections, or Law Enforcement with option in Corrections.

II Institutions offering corrections courses for credit.

III Institutions offering non-credit courses, seminars or institutes in Corrections.

IV Institutions offering related programs.

V Institutions planning to implement courses and/or full degree programs by academic year 1973-1974.

VI Institutions expressing interest in developing programs or courses.

VII Information from sources other than survey indicates institutions offering programs in Corrections; types not specified.

with only loose linkage between the corrections authorities and the college. In the discussion that follows these approaches are reviewed.

A. THE SINGLE COURSE

The single course approach to corrections education may be more feasible than a one-year certificate or a two-year associate degree in certain specific circumstances. Many colleges and corrections agencies find advantages in the single course approach.

If a quick response to a particular limited demand from corrections agencies is desirable, the single course approach is a common practice among community and junior colleges. In this case, the course may be an "Introduction to Corrections" or it may address a particular need such as is implied by the title "Human Relations as Applied to Corrections." If correctional administrators of state institutions constitute the enrollees, the college may turn to the students for assistance in designing the course to meet their particular interests and needs. Similarly, jail personnel in a local community may express uncertainty as to their needs and may desire to remain flexible. The seminar or workshop is a popular approach for addressing the needs of such groups.

Often the market for a program cannot be ascertained by survey or the specific educational needs of the prospective students are not identifiable. In such cases, a single course offered on a pilot basis may test the extent of the interest and the desired content. Should the pilot offering demonstrate an adequate interest, the college then may proceed with the establishment of additional courses with considerably less risk than would be otherwise possible. On the other hand, if the interest and need is satisfied by a single course, the college may easily withdraw the service without serious internal adjustment.

B. CERTIFICATE PROGRAM IN CORRECTIONS

An approach that provides considerable flexibility consists of a certificate program including courses in corrections to serve a specific need or client organization. City Colleges of Chicago, through its Public Service Institute, developed a module of corrections courses to serve primarily the Cook County corrections system. These courses may be taken as a free-standing set of courses leading to a certificate and may be applied toward an associate degree. The advantage often cited for the certificate program of this type is that in-service personnel may be upgraded educationally by taking courses that pertain specifically to the field of corrections. The certificate program at City Colleges of Chicago is outlined in Table 6.

Table 6. Certificate Program in Corrections

City Colleges of Chicago - Loop College
Chicago, Illinois

Correctional Institutional Management	3
Crime and Corrections I (emphasis on criminology)	3
Crime and Corrections II (emphasis on penology)	3
Issues in Corrections	3

C. TWO-YEAR ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAM

In responding to the need to improve the quality of personnel working at the line level in corrections, some community colleges choose to develop an associate degree curriculum. The primary objective is to prepare a previously inexperienced person to enter the field of corrections with basic competencies pertinent to corrections and a foundation in general education. Many of the associate degree programs that exist currently

reflect the curriculum suggestions found in Guidelines for Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges.[14]

As noted earlier, the actual design, approval, and implementation of a program by a community college is influenced by many limiting and permissive factors; therefore, considerable variation in programs exists. The program at Dutchess Community College (New York) may be cited as an example of an associate degree program (see Table 7). Out of a total of sixty-four semester hours of credit in the two-year sequence twenty-five pertain directly to corrections.

Table 7. Associate Degree Program in Corrections

Dutchess Community College
Poughkeepsie, New York

FIRST YEAR		SECOND YEAR	
FIRST SEMESTER		THIRD SEMESTER	
Introduction to Expository Writing	3	Institutional Treatment of the Criminal I	3
Introduction to Behavioral Sciences	3	Institutional Treatment of the Young Offender	3
Criminology I	4	Drug Use and Addiction	2
Man and His Environment	4	Interpersonal Relations	3
Physical Education	1	Fundamentals of Public Speaking	3
		Recommended Elective	3
	15		17
SECOND SEMESTER		FOURTH SEMESTER	
Composition: Language and Literature	3	Institutional Treatment of the Criminal II	3
Introduction to Contemporary Society	3	Correction Law	3
Mathematics Elective	3	Probation and Parole	3
Criminology II	5	Patterns of Inmate Behavior	3
Contemporary Health Problems	2	Recommended Elective	3
Advanced Physical Education Skills	1		
	17		15

Generally speaking, in New York community colleges, curricula for corrections education, as in the case of Dutchess Community College, are developed in response to the needs of correctional institutions in the communities served by the colleges.

D. STATE TRAINING INSTITUTE INTEGRATED WITH ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAMS

Lakewood State Junior College (Minnesota) offers an associate degree program designed to integrate with the Institute of Human Development of the Minnesota Department of Corrections. The Minnesota approach has several notable features:

-- five courses at the Institute of Human Development (a training academy) are included in the associate degree program at the College
-- staff of the College teach the five courses at the Institute
-- both the program at the Institute and the associate degree program at the College place heavy emphasis on counseling as the major function of the line officer
-- work experience through internship is given credit as an integral part of the curriculum
-- the services of the College are mobile in that the courses are taken to the locations of the state's correctional facilities
-- close coordination of the training and education activities of the Minnesota Department of Corrections and Lakewood State Junior College exists
-- as employees of the Department of Corrections transfer from one facility to another, the educational development of the employee has continuity.

Table 8 outlines the approach followed in Minnesota.

Table 8. The Minnesota Approach

INSTITUTE FOR HUMAN DEVELOPMENT
Minnesota Department of Corrections Training Academy

INSTITUTE COURSES

	Credit Hours
Introduction to Corrections	3
Institutional Organization and Operation	3
Correctional Counseling Techniques	3
Introduction to Sociology	3
Corrections Internship	6
Total Credit Hours	18

LAKEWOOD STATE JUNIOR COLLEGE, White Bear Lake, Minnesota

ASSOCIATE DEGREE PROGRAM

Corrections Courses	Credit Hours
Introduction to Corrections	3
Institutional Organization and Operation	3
Principles of Behavior Modification	3
Correctional Counseling Techniques	3
Correctional Counseling Practicum	4
Group Counseling	3
Corrections Internship	6
	25

Career Electives	Credit Hours
Abnormal Development	3
Criminal Behavior	3
Criminal Law	3
General Psychology I-II	6
Introduction to Child Development	3
Introduction to Social Welfare	3
Personal Development	2
Social Work Issues and Intergroup Relations	3
Speech Fundamentals	3
	29

General Education Requirements	Credit Hours
English (Basic Composition)	3
Afro-American Culture	3
Computational Mathematics	3
Physical Education/Health	3
Afro-American History	3
	15
Other Electives	21
Total Credit Hours	90

E. HUMAN SERVICES EMPHASIS

At the College of DuPage (serving a suburban area of Chicago), an associate degree curriculum for human services careers has been developed which includes an emphasis on corrections. The initial course in the sequence is a "Survey of Human Service Systems." Courses specifically related to corrections include "Contemporary Treatment Approaches" and "Survey of Juvenile Justice System." The associate degree program allows thirty-five quarter hours of general education and fifteen quarter hours of credit for field experience. Table 9 outlines the program at the College of DuPage.

Table 9. Associate Degree Program in Corrections with a Human Services Emphasis

College of DuPage
Glen Ellyn, Illinois

FIRST QUARTER	
Survey of Human Service Systems	5
Think Tank (seminar)	1
Sociology	3-5
General Education Elective	5
	14-16
SECOND QUARTER	
Think Tank (seminar)	1
Group Dynamics	5
Empathy Laboratory	5
General Education Elective	5
	16
THIRD QUARTER	
Think Tank (seminar)	1
Group Dynamics	5
Culture and Institutions of Minorities	3
Applied Community Organization	3
General Education Elective	5
	17
FOURTH QUARTER	
Think Tank (seminar)	1
Field Experience	5
Technical Communication	3
Contemporary Treatment Approaches	3
General Education Elective	5
	17
FIFTH QUARTER	
Think Tank (seminar)	1
Field Experience	5
Survey of Juvenile Justice System	5
General Education Elective	5
	16
SIXTH QUARTER	
Think Tank (seminar)	1
Field Experience	5
General Education Elective	10
	16

F. CRIMINAL JUSTICE CORE

Recently the California Community College System undertook the task of developing a core of criminal justice courses that would include an option in corrections. The courses in the core consist of:[15]

-- Introduction to the Administration of Justice
-- Principles and Procedures of the Justice System
-- Concepts of Criminal Law
-- Legal Aspects of Evidence
-- Community Relations

The five core courses are being integrated into the pre-employment and transfer programs of the California Community Colleges. Table 10 outlines the associate degree program in corrections being adopted by California.

Table 10. Criminal Justice Core

California Community Colleges			
FIRST YEAR		SECOND YEAR	
FIRST SEMESTER		THIRD SEMESTER	
Physical Education	½	Physical Education	½
English	3	Speech	3
Sociology	3	Anthropology	3
Health	1	Math	3
Intro. Admin. Justice	3	Legal Aspects of Evidence	3
Prin. and Procedures of Justice System	3	Community Relations	3
Concepts of Law	3		
	16½		15½
SECOND SEMESTER		FOURTH SEMESTER	
Physical Education	½	Physical Education	½
Psychology	3	Psychology	3
History	3	Philosophy	3
Biology	3	Biology	3
Institutional and Field Services for Corrections	3	Technical Writing	3
Fundamentals of Crime and Delinquency	3	Counseling and Interviewing	3
	15½		15½

The pattern may vary slightly among the many community colleges in California; however, the five core courses and those in the option area for corrections, provide a twenty-four semester unit major for the associate degree. The purpose of the program is to provide the student with an adequate background for immediate employment in corrections or transfer to a four-year degree program in corrections.

G. DIVISION OF RESPONSIBILITY BETWEEN ASSOCIATE DEGREE AND BACCALAUREATE PROGRAMS

A significant development in articulation is taking place in Virginia under an agreement developed between the Northern Virginia Community College and George Mason University. Instruction in the basic competencies related to corrections is provided in the associate degree program at Northern Virginia Community College. George Mason University offers a concentration of general education courses in the junior and senior years of the baccalaureate program accepting the Northern Virginia associate degree credits. Such a division of responsibility may very well be the beginning of a trend that would reduce the competition that sometimes exists between two-year and four-year institutions over students, control of curriculum content, and funds earmarked for corrections education. This arrangement recognizes the fact that historically universities have been anti-vocational with the liberal arts role being where their strength lies.[16]

Table 11 outlines the associate degree program at Northern Virginia Community College.

Table 11. Associate Degree Program in Corrections Science

Northern Virginia Community College
Annandale, Virginia

Course Title		Course Title	
FIRST QUARTER		SECOND QUARTER	
Orientation	1	Communication Skills II (or ENGL 112)	3
Communication Skills I (or ENGL 111)	3	Speech Communications	3
Intro. to Corrections	3	Criminal Offenses	3
Psychology of Personal Adjustment	3	Criminology	3
Introductory Sociology I	3	Introductory Sociology II	3
Prevention and Control of Juvenile Delinquency	3	Assessment of the Correctional Process	3
Fundamentals of Physical Activity	1		
Total	17	Total	18
THIRD QUARTER		FOURTH QUARTER	
Technical Writing	3	Treatment of the Offender	3
Interviewing Skills	3	Assessment of Criminology	3
Corrections and the Community	3	Social Problems I	3
Introductory Sociology III	3	Social Psychology	3
Criminal Behavior	3	Elective	1
Elective	1	American Economics	3
Total	16	Total	16
FIFTH QUARTER		SIXTH QUARTER	
Jail Operation Mgt. I	3	Seminar and Project	3
Legal Challenge to Corrections	3	Jail Operation and Mgt. II	3
Social Problems II	3	Law Enforcement and the Community	3
Law Enforcement Psychology	3	American Constitutional Government	3
Administration of Justice	3	Coordinated Internship	3
Total	15	Total	15

Total Minimum Credits for Degree in Corrections Science 97

H. THE MULTIPLE CORE APPROACH

In workshops held as part of the four inter-regional conferences conducted under the project, curriculum development was a major topic. An outgrowth of the discussions in these workshops was the outline of alternative curriculum approaches. The concept of the multiple core curriculum for corrections was one of the approaches that was given consideration. Essentially, the concept emphasizes the desirability of approaching the education of correctional officers with clusters of courses intended to develop competencies in critical areas.

For instance, Table 12 outlines a curriculum discussed in the workshop which suggests four basic areas of competencies:

-- corrections competencies
-- criminal justice competencies
-- human services competencies
-- general competencies.

Similarly one workshop group suggested a four core approach consisting of:[17]

-- technical skills
-- professional skills
-- conceptual skills
-- general understandings.

Technical skills were defined as those skills needed for carrying out specific duties, and usually taught through on-the-job training. The following technical skills were identified:

-- supervision of individual and groups
-- security and custody
-- oral communication.

Table 12. Multiple Core Approach to Corrections Education: Suggested Associate Degree Program

	Semester Hours
Core of Corrections Courses	
An Overview of Corrections: Theories, Systems and Operations	3
Treatment of the Offender: Institutional Setting	3
Treatment of the Offender: Community Setting	3
Correctional Counseling: Strategies and Techniques	6
Using Social Service Agencies and Volunteers in Corrections	3
Supervised Work Experience in Corrections	3
Core of Criminal Justice Courses	
Criminal Justice Systems: A Review of Local, State, and Federal Processes and Practices	3
Analysis of Criminal Behavior and Juvenile Delinquency	3
Selected Concepts of Criminal Law	3
Field Studies in Criminal Justice	3
Core of Human Services Courses	
Introduction to Mental Health	3
Selected Studies of Deviant Behavior	3
Techniques of Organizing Group Activities and Recreational Leadership	3
Techniques of Career and Educational Guidance	3
Core of General Development Courses	
Introduction to Social Science	3
Effective Oral Communication	3
Report Writing	3
Introduction to Minority Cultures	3
Government: An Analysis of Structure and Operations	3
Total Semester Hours of Credit	60

Professional skills were defined as specific knowledge related to the broad areas of correctional officer work. The following professional skills were identified:

-- fundamentals of casework classification
-- identification of relevant data
-- counseling techniques
-- law
-- criminal justice systems
-- knowledge of methods of intervention
-- group processes
-- mobilizing community resources.

Conceptual skills were defined as the ability to adapt to changing conditions and to make practical application of general understanding and professional skills. The following conceptual skills were identified:

-- decision-making
-- problem-solving
-- principles of organization
-- relationships
-- sensitivity to cultural backgrounds and an awareness of cultural feelings, attitudes and perspectives in relation to the establishment, authority, and historical contributions.

General understanding was defined as knowledge related to corrections work. The following areas of understanding were identified:

-- determinants of human behavior
-- self-awareness
-- communication skills
-- interpersonal relations.

I. SUMMARY

The major conclusion based on the review of these programs is that there is a wide range of options available in corrections education in community colleges. Educational approaches vary considerably and often reflect the extent of cooperation between state corrections and community college officials, the level of educational preparation of correctional officers employed in a particular system, the degree of initiative taken locally either by the correctional institution or a community college, or jointly, the specific objectives underlying the educational program, the numbers of correctional employees in a given community or state, the career structure in a particular state, among other considerations.

In analyzing curricula in community colleges, one observer noted that educators tend to display a lack of understanding of the realities of corrections -- the functions and structure of corrections, how the system works, the characteristics of offenders. The inclusion of such courses as criminal investigation and rules of evidence in educational programs to prepare line personnel supports this position. Some curricula suggest that there is a lack of contact between the college and corrections.

Whether a community college addresses the needs of corrections via the single course approach, a certificate program, an associate degree program, or by close coordination of the college program with the training efforts of correctional agencies, generally speaking, the decision will reflect the conditions pertaining to that college and to the correctional agencies with which it is working. Effective educational programs in corrections cannot be abstract nor can they be designed on the basis of fear that the educational program will look too much like a training program.

V. STANDARDS FOR IMPROVEMENT OF EDUCATION OF LINE OFFICERS IN CORRECTIONS

> There has been considerable controversy over the kind and level of formal training required of these employees who work primarily with individual offenders in their daily life situations (case managers, institutional counselors, parole officers, and probation officers). The prevailing standards, established largely by national professional organizations and encouraged by some federal agencies, are by no means universally accepted by correctional agencies. In fact, in the view of many observers, this disagreement has served to retard the growth of educational programs for the field of corrections. --A Time to Act.[18]

Among the most frequent issues encountered in meetings and conferences attended or conducted by the staff of the Correctional Officers Educational Program was that of strategies for improving the quality of educational programs. The discussions regarding this topic ranged over a wide array of sub-issues. Among these are the following:

-- How can educational objectives be constructed to reflect the tasks of line personnel in corrections?

-- How can the various functions of the criminal justice process -- police, courts, corrections -- be treated as separate and distinct functions without loss of their relationship to the total criminal justice process?

-- How can education and training become integrated to reflect the day-to-day work situation of the correctonal officer?

-- How can state-wide planning of manpower development and educational programming for corrections be strengthened?

-- What changes in legislation and administrative innovations are necessary to enhance the interrelationship of the career structure for corrections and the educational programs in a state?

-- How can the flow of funds to cover costs of curriculum development, instruction, guidance and placement, and student assistance be stabilized at levels consistent with the magnitude of personnel improvement needs of corrections?

These were the issues frequently raised at meetings and conferences conducted by the project and during individual consultations. Deliberate action was considered crucial to improve the quality of educational programs for corrections offered in community and junior colleges. It became apparent that standards addressing the conditions associated with the issues needed to be developed.

Whereas the Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training in A Time to Act[19] cites the need for realistic educational standards for manpower employed in corrections, it was the general belief of participants in the conferences conducted by this project that, in addition to educational standards for employees, standards for the total delivery of education and training for corrections manpower are needed.

In an effort to provide guidance to state, local, and federal correctional agencies, state community college agencies, and to community colleges, a number of suggested standards have been developed. Inputs obtained from the proceedings at conferences, meetings with community college staff and correctional administrators in selected

states, and consultation with other selected authorities in corrections, law, education, and other interested segments of the community provided the basis for the development of the suggested standards.

Although each standard, as described herein, is intended to reflect national conditions in the aggregate, each state and community may find the standards useful suggestions in addressing particular situations. The standards should facilitate the joining together of appropriate officials into a coalition of interests critical to the improvement of corrections education. In each instance as the standard is described, selected cases are cited where information was available on the employment of practices related to the standard.

A. STATE PLANS FOR CORRECTIONS EDUCATION

The Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 prescribes the establishment of a state agency to engage in planning to bring improvements in criminal justice. A study of state plans, developed by the state planning agencies to meet the conditions of the Act, revealed that significant gaps existed regarding corrections education.[20] Of primary concern is the lack of attention given in the plans to the training and education of correctional officers. Secondly, only in thirteen states (this number includes the District of Columbia and Puerto Rico) were two-year community and junior colleges clearly identified as a potential resource for improving the quality of correctional manpower; yet every state has two-year community and junior colleges, or technical institutes, capable of offering programs in corrections. Thirdly, in some states, where two-year colleges are known to be offering certificate and associate degree programs, state planning agencies are unaware of their

existence or do not consider them to be of sufficient significance to identify these programs in the state plan.

Often the annual plans of the state community college agency and the state vocational education agency will contain information of value to corrections planning. In addition, manpower planning is being facilitated through the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) and the local Manpower Area Planning Councils (MAPC). Under the Intergovernmental Personnel Act, progress is being made to improve the quality of manpower in government generally. The operation of state criminal justice planning agencies may be strengthened by efforts to merge their planning activities with the manpower training and education efforts of these and other agencies.[21]

Indeed, in reviewing the Education Amendments of 1972, improved state planning of education and training was given a high priority by Congress. Duplication of efforts among the various units of government may be reduced and gaps in training and education needs may be identified and more effectively addressed as a result. The utilization of scarce resources is likely to be improved in the process.

Suggested Standard. Priority should be given by the state planning agencies to the development and implementation of a comprehensive plan for corrections education which focuses on the manpower needs associated with line functions. State planning of manpower development and education in corrections may be improved by meeting the following minimum conditions:

1. Periodic assessment of the manpower needs in corrections, especially for the line officer functions performed in various correctional environments.
2. Periodic survey of corrections programs in the community and junior colleges and the extent of the utilization of these resources.
3. Reference in the state plan to the findings of such surveys, and an interpretation of the significance of the findings for training and education programs.

4. Deliberate plans to expand the utilization of community and junior college resources.
5. Coordination of state criminal justice planning with the planning of state and local corrections agencies, state education agencies, and manpower agencies.

B. EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT AND CAREER OPPORTUNITIES IN CORRECTIONS

In a survey of state criminal justice planning agencies, it was determined that career ladders existed in many states as regards vertical progression through the basic correctional officer position to higher positions.[22] Unfortunately, of thirty-eight responding state agencies, eleven indicated that career ladders do not exist for corrections in their states.

Where career ladders exist, promotion is based largely on experience, seniority, and general performance. In over seventy percent of the cases, educational attainment was not a prerequisite for promotion. In no case did college-level attainment appear to be required for promotion of line staff.

Although educational attainment is not a requisite for promotion, over seventy-five percent of the states indicated that education was a factor in line officer promotion. A notable exception was Michigan, where the attainment of an associate or higher degree results in a review for promotion. In Rhode Island, completion of four approved courses can lead to a one-step pay increase. Oregon indicated that current collective bargaining negotiations applicable to correctional staff were considering differential pay to personnel completing two-year degrees.

Suggested Standard. The relationship between educational attainment and the career structure in corrections should be strengthened. The

following elements linking educational attainment and career opportunities are necessary to improve line personnel in corrections:

1. Establishment of minimum educational requirement of an associate degree for employment in a line capacity.
2. Probationary employment in cases of evidence of progress toward the minimum eudcational requirements.
3. Recognition of educational attainment in pay increases and promotion to higher levels of responsibility.
4. Periodic review of the minimum educational requirements.
5. Job engineering of the correctional functions to give qualified line personnel greater responsibility in rehabilitation of offenders.
6. Design of career ladders emphasizing the need for progressive educational improvement of personnel.
7. Development of improved channels of communication between corrections administrators, civil service authorities, and community college administrators.

C. ASSISTANCE TO LINE OFFICER FOR PARTICIPATION IN EDUCATION

Of thirty-five states responding to a questionnaire regarding state assistance, other than assistance under the Law Enforcement Education Program, eighteen reported some kind of state assistance to correctional officers enrolled in two-year colleges.[23] Table 13 summarizes the findings (some states reported more than one form of assistance).

Table 13. Assistance for Educational Participation

Form of Assistance	No. of States
Tuition reimbursement or rebates	10
Educational leave	7
Released time for attendance	8
Shift changes or working hour adjustments	3
Use of state vehicle for transportation	1

Minnesota reported financial aid to line officers under a statutory provision for in-service, pre-service, internship, and scholarship programs. Under the Unified Code of Corrections, the Illinois Department of Corrections may make "grants-in-aid" for academic study and training

in fields related to corrections. Shift changes were allowed in Oregon and in Maryland, and working hour adjustments were permitted in Florida to accommodate enrollment in educational programs. Line officer participation in educational programs tends to be strengthened by such forms of direct assistance.

Inasmuch as community and junior colleges are generally low-cost institutions, the resources needed to support a financial assistance program to encourage associate degree attainment are not likely to be prohibitive. There are usually no dormitory costs associated with attendance at community colleges. Tuition is often relatively low compared with many other institutions of higher education.

Financial assistance to enrollees in educational programs was considered by participants at conferences conducted under this project to be an effective measure to increase the number of minority personnel in the field of corrections. In cities and states having large American Indian, Black, and Spanish speaking populations, the use of financial assistance should not be overlooked as a means to encourage persons from these minority groups to enroll in educational programs preparing them for careers in corrections.

Suggested Standard. A comprehensive system of assistance to encourage the participation of present and prospective line personnel in corrections education should be developed by the states. Such a system should include:

1. **Statutory provision of financial aid to in-service and pre-service personnel enrolled in associate degree programs in community colleges.**
2. **The utilization of a combination of incentives including the following:**
   a. **Grants to full-time students.**
   b. **Tuition reimbursement or rebates.**
   c. **Educational leave for full-time attendance.**
   d. **Released time for part-time attendance.**
   e. **Shift changes or working hour adjustments to accommodate attendance.**

3. Periodic review of assistance programs to determine their adequacy.

D. INTEGRATION OF TRAINING AND EDUCATION

Over the years a separation between training and education has occurred, compounding the problems of improving the quality of personnel in corrections. Sharp distinctions between training and education are mere abstractions which fail to realize that a blending of the competencies gained through experience, training and education occurs in the course of the effective performance of daily duties by a correctional officer.[24]

In cases where no effort is made to relate training and education, educational opportunities are offered without any reference to training. In many local institutions no provisions are made to give training to corrections employees, yet the line personnel are encouraged to attend educational programs consisting of highly abstract concepts. Often funding authorities contribute to the problem as they administer the distribution of funds on the basis of elitist notions as to what constitutes training and where education begins. Human development is too complex a process to allow such luxuries.[25]

Manpower development for corrections may be strengthened with the coordination of training academies and community college programs. If activities of training academies and programs of educational institutions are uncoordinated, gaps occur, economies are lost, and the overall effectiveness of training and education programs are reduced.

Cases may be cited where progress is being made to integrate education and training. In Minnesota, several courses in the corrections academy, called the Institute for Human Development, are identical

to courses in the associate degree program offered by Lakewood State Junior College, which has the responsibility for offering corrections education.

Florida Junior College at Jacksonville operates the Northeast Florida Criminal Justice Training and Education Center. Plans are being developed to relate training in corrections at the Center to the on-going associate degree program.[26] Such arrangements are likely to reduce duplication, reflect a recognition of the interdependency of training and education, and serve to facilitate continuity in learning, thereby motivating correctional personnel to progress up the training and education ladder.

In New York, efforts are underway by the community colleges and the State Department of Correctional Services to grant credit toward the associate degree for instructional components of the Department's training program for line personnel.

In a study developed by AACJC, Law Enforcement Training and the Community College: Alternatives for Affiliation,[27] a number of advantages gained by improving the coordination of training and education are cited. If a community college program and an academy for training of recruits in corrections exist as administratively separate entities, efforts should be made to develop some form of affiliation between the academy and the community college.

Military training in corrections is assessed by the Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience (CASE), American Council on Education, to determine the character and specific content of such training programs.[28] Recommendations are available from CASE regarding the

equivalency of military training to college programs for the purpose of granting credit for training received by former servicemen interested in attending community colleges. These precedents serve to give credence to the concept of integrated training and education as a means to improving the quality of personnel in corrections.

Suggested Standard. Efforts to integrate training and education should be accelerated. To insure that training and education in corrections will not be unrelated, the following minimum conditions should be met:

1. A single state agency should be given the responsibility to coordinate all training and education in corrections throughout the state.
2. Communication channels between training academies and community colleges should be established and plans developed to reduce barriers to integrated training and education efforts.
3. All training and education programs associated with the initial preparation of new line personnel, the upgrading of existing employees, and the development of competencies in a pre-employment situation should be identified by that agency.
4. The competencies being addressed in these programs should be cataloged.
5. Educational institutions, training academies, and agencies engaged in the development of the various competencies should be identified.
6. Gaps or omissions in the development of essential competencies should be ascertained and measures initiated to insure that all resources (community colleges and training academies) will be utilized to close the gaps in the development of competencies needed for effective performance of line personnel.

E. IMPROVEMENT OF INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAMS

In reviewing the instructional programs offered by community colleges, considerable variation in approaches to corrections education was found. Programs often appeared to reflect the needs of the corrections personnel employed in particular local institutions as perceived by the staff of a particular college. Courses found in a curriculum often have only a general relation to corrections rather than being related to a specific

competency or set of competencies required to function effectively. Some courses, such as those on criminal investigation and rules of evidence, have little value in preparing line personnel for corrections. These findings suggest the need for revision in most programs.

In a survey of corrections administrators and educators from forty-four states, ninety-five percent saw the need to differentiate curricula for corrections personnel from those administered to police officers.[29] Although administrative convenience sometimes leads to a consolidation of all criminal justice enrollees into the same courses, there are basic arguments for the separation of the instruction programs for police, court, and corrections personnel. The major argument for such a separation is that competencies needed for apprehension of offenders, or the court functions, have little relationship to those needed in offender rehabilitation.

Economies in costs gained by combining the three functions are likely to be offset by losses in effective educational programming. This separation would not preclude the possibility of a cluster of criminal justice courses pertaining to all aspects of the criminal justice system being offered as a part of a program which at some point separates the cluster of courses pertaining only to corrections functions.

As suggested earlier, a core of corrections courses as an option within a framework of criminal justice and human services seems desirable. In this case, corrections students receive course content which is designed specifically to develop the competencies necessary to perform corrections functions without neglecting the concept of a total criminal justice system and the relationship of the system to improved human

services. The possibility of neglecting adequate instruction in corrections functions in the judicial and human service processes is strengthened.

Sound program development, however, rarely takes place. Expediencies emerge to accommodate funding considerations, influences of faculty and college administrative practices, the characteristics of the incoming students, and the availability of faculty, among others. In addition, many programs now in existence, although perhaps less than optimal in character, are not likely to be abolished suddenly in favor of new, more systematically designed curricula.

Under these conditions, improvements in instructional programs are likely to be a function of fiscal incentives, careful selection and improved development of instructional staff, improved state and local planning, and the interests of the decision-makers in the local and state correctional agencies. Many of these factors are beyond the control of the community college, but college staff should undertake efforts to affect these factors. State criminal justice planning agencies, state community college agencies, and state vocational education agencies all have a responsibility in improving the quality of instructional programs and should be encouraged to collaborate with correctional agencies and local community colleges in such efforts.

Often educational programs in corrections are criticized for the lack of realistic linkage with the field being served. Consequently, the integration of work experience early in the student's educational program is a high priority for the pre-service student interested in corrections as a career. Work experience components should be designed as an integral

part of a curriculum in corrections with on-the-job performance standards being required and credit toward the certificate or associate degree being granted.[30]

In the case of the student who has had considerable experience working in the field of corrections, the experience should be assessed and credit toward the certificate or degree granted where appropriate. It may be desirable to combine the review of the individual's work record with a written and oral examination as a basis for granting credit.

Suggested Standard. The improvement of instructional programs in community colleges may be accomplished by strict adherence to sound practices in the development and implementation of corrections programs. The following elements consitute a minimum plan for a community college program:

1. An analysis of correctional officer functions must be conducted to determine the specific tasks performed.
2. Competencies needed to perform these tasks effectively must be outlined.
3. The specific competency-needs that the community college has the capability to address should be identified.
4. These competency-needs should be formulated into student performance objectives.
5. Specific educational units needed to reach the student performance objectives must be developed.
6. Specific courses must be designed to deliver the specified educational units.
7. Such courses must be structured into appropriate certificate and/or associate degree curricula.
8. Techniques must be developed to produce a well-balanced educational program to produce the desired quality of graduates -- work experience, laboratory, classroom, field studies.
9. The characteristics of prospective students (in-service, pre-service, etc.) must be identified and taken into consideration in the design of the instructional program.
10. Instructors of courses in corrections should have had prior experience in corrections.
11. Practical work experience should be made an integral part of the curriculum with credit for such experience being granted.
12. Prior work experiences should be assessed by the college

for equivalency to the educational program and credit granted in appropriate cases.

13. Provisions must be made to evaluate the effectiveness of instruction, work experience components, and related support services.
14. Follow-up of graduates of programs to determine their ability to function in the correctional environment is critical and should become regularized.
15. Program development and evaluation should include inputs from practitioners in the field of corrections through individual consultations and the utilization of an advisory committee.

F. ROLE OF UNIVERSITIES IN RELATION TO COMMUNITY COLLEGE CORRECTIONS PROGRAMS

Very few universities offer a baccalaureate or master's degree in corrections. On the other hand, there are almost 100 community and junior colleges that offer, or soon will be offering, programs leading to certificates and associate degrees. It is not unusual to hear an official of a university say "What are community colleges doing to make their courses transferable?" The question really is "What are universities doing to adjust to the community college programs?"

Certainly, transferability is an issue for the few students moving into the university, but the bulk of community college students in corrections programs relate to the line functions and transferability may never become an issue. Nationally, a large percentage of community college students are primarily interested in early employment making transferability to a university the concern of a select few. Furthermore, given the present career structure of line operations in corrections, it seems premature to produce large numbers of persons with baccalaureate degrees.

A realignment of roles for post-secondary educational institutions

seems to be in order. Rather than have universities compete with community colleges in the preparation of line personnel, the university might well take on the role of preparing administrators, planners, faculty for community colleges, and researchers. The program activities of community colleges and universities should be designed to reflect their strengths. Community colleges are comfortable with mixing skill development and liberal arts to prepare a person in the competencies needed for line performance in the public services. On the other hand, the interest of the universities in too many cases has been with pure academics resisting close alignment with the manpower needs of social agencies.[31]

An innovation in articulation may very well have been developed in the case of George Mason University and Northern Virginia Community College. As noted earlier, Northern Virginia Community College has the role of providing the basic competencies needed for line performance. George Mason University has agreed to accept students from Northern Virginia and to concentrate on providing the general education concepts usually identified with responsibilities at the administrative levels of the hierarchy.

Recently in California, an articulation conference recommended that four-year institutions accept for transfer the fifteen semester units for the five course core curriculum in administration of justice, and an additional nine semester units in options, such as corrections. California state universities and colleges have accepted this concept and the University of California System has accepted for transfer the fifteen semester units of the five core courses.

Suggested Standard. The minimum conditions concerning university and community college relations in corrections education for the future should consist of the following:

1. The educational content of programs at various levels of education -- associate degree, baccalaureate degree, master's degree, doctor's degree -- should reflect the needs of career positions in the career structure of the field of corrections.
2. Preparation in the competencies needed for early entry into employment in line positions should be the primary objective of community college programs with transferability to a university being a secondary objective contingent upon successful line experience in corrections.
3. The technical and/or basic professional competencies increasingly should be offered early in post-secondary education with more generalized skills to be developed as the person moves to more advanced education.
4. A realignment of university functions should be encouraged to concentrate on preparation of administrative, executive, research, and teaching personnel.
5. Agreements to enhance linkages between community college programs in corrections and the baccalaureate programs should be developed.
6. Competition between community colleges and universities for students, financial support, and control over curriculum should be diminished in favor of cooperation to serve the needs of the field of corrections.

G. LEGISLATION TO IMPROVE CORRECTIONS EDUCATION

The state legislature can affect the education and training of line personnel in corrections in at least five ways:

-- By encouraging community colleges to work with correctional agencies in providing improved educational opportunities for line personnel.

-- By creating a climate in which staff of correctional agencies are not only required to utilize their training and education but are appropriately recognized for improving educational qualifications.

-- By providing educational stipends, adequate compensation, and other incentives to encourage educational attainment.

-- By mandating minimum qualifications for hiring of line personnel which include educational requirements such as attainment of an associate degree.

-- By strengthening job security through the rejection of political patronage as a condition of employment.

Some states have turned to legislative mandates to facilitate educational attainment. Examples of such states are Minnesota and California. In Minnesota, legislation authorizes educational stipends, tuition reimbursement, and internship programs to improve personnel in corrections. In Maryland, legislation has created an apparatus to establish and implement minimum standards for the development of competent correctional personnel including recommended salary structures and minimum and recommended standards for the recruitment, selection and training of correctional personnel. In both states, community and junior colleges have significant roles in improving the quality of manpower in corrections.

An effective legislative program for line officer improvement requires an alignment of support of many interested groups. A coalition of support consisting of the corrections profession, the legal profession, community and junior college supporters and other educators, social service agencies, community service organizations, labor unions, and the press, among others, is critical to the successful development and passage of legislation to improve education and training for line personnel in corrections.[32]

Suggested Standard. An affirmative program of legislation must be developed in the states to provide for sound educational programming in community colleges and to support educational attainment by line personnel in corrections. The following measures should be undertaken to insure that an adequate legislative program for line officer education is developed:

1. A coalition of practitioners, educators, and legal authorities should be organized to design a legislative program for corrections education.
2. The legislative program should include the following provisions:
   a. Minimum educational requirements for line positions in corrections.
   b. Recognition of educational attainment through compensation and advancement.
   c. Incentives to induce educational attainment such as educational stipends, tuition reimbursement, and educational leave.
   d. Establishment of a permanent body to identify manpower needs, to develop training and education standards, and to evaluate the effectiveness of programs.
   e. Incentives to community colleges to improve educational programs such as funds for curriculum innovation, counseling and guidance, and faculty development.
3. A campaign to educate members of the legislature in the manpower needs of corrections should be undertaken.
4. Members of the legislature willing to sponsor proposed legislation should be identified and their support should be solicited.
5. Linkages should be developed with representatives and senators in Congress to insure that state interests are represented in Federal legislation pertaining to corrections.

H. SUMMARY

A recurrent theme permeating the activities of this project has been that of improving personnel for line functions in corrections through certificate and associate degree programs in community and junior colleges. To insure that such educational programs are of the highest quality, reflect the needs of corrections, and have maximum impact upon the field of

corrections, a number of standards are suggested. These suggestions are intended to serve as guidelines to enhance the dialogue among agencies, educational institutions, professional groups, and other organizations desirous of improving corrections education in their communities and states.

These suggested standards relate to the effectiveness of state planning for corrections education, the responsiveness of the career structure in corrections to the educational attainment of employees and prospective employees, assistance programs in support of line officer improvement, modifications in the structure of training and education, elevating the quality of instruction in community college programs, new roles for educational institutions, and the development of comprehensive legislative programs in the states to mandate changes. The provisions of the suggested standards reflect trends already underway in some states.

Throughout these standards, the importance of collaboration among the many elements having an interest in improved correctional systems in the states and the nation is highlighted. Emphasis is placed on the community and junior colleges as vehicles for the improvement of line personnel in corrections, but the improvement of educational programs for line personnel requires the joint involvement of agencies, professions, and institutions.

The worth of these suggestions will be measured by the extent to which agencies, professional organizations, and the educational institutions respond. The standards, as stated herein, are more challenges to the concerned principals than perfected specifications for corrections education programs in community and junior colleges.

REFERENCES

[1] A Time to Act, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D. C., October, 1969. The Joint Commission consisted on 95 national, international, and regional organizations and public agencies, with funds primarily under the Correctional Rehabilitation Study Act of 1965. A study of education, training, and manpower utilization needs of correctional agencies was conducted and A Time to Act is the final report on the study.

[2] Ibid., p. 30.

[3] Fox, Vernon B., Guidelines for Corrections Programs in Community and Junior Colleges, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

[4] The Virginia Division of Justice and Crime Prevention, Commonwealth of Virginia, sponsored the grant from the Law Enforcement Assistance Administration, U. S. Department of Justice.

[5] Uniform Correctional Policies and Procedures, Association of State Correctional Administrators, Columbia, South Carolina, 1972, p. 24.

[6] Criminology and Corrections Programs, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D. C., July, 1968.

[7] A Time to Act, op. cit., pp. 11-23.

[8] Brewer, Donald and Blair, Carol Ann, In-Service Training and Probation, Parole, and Correctional Personnel: A Plan for Action, Athens, Georgia, Institute of Government, University of Georgia, February, 1968.

[9] Correction Officers Training Guide, American Correctional Association, College Park, Maryland, 1959, pp. 14-18.

[10] Ibid.

[11] Fox, op. cit., pp. 18-22.

[12] Based on unpublished data obtained through a survey of corrections administrators and educators from forty-four states who participated in conferences conducted under this project during 1972.

[13] From unpublished report of workshop proceedings at Southern States Conference on Correctional Officers Educational Program, December 14-15, 1972, Mobile, Alabama, prepared by Joann B. Morton.

[14] Fox, op. cit.

[15] Administration of Justice Education, Chancellor's Office, California Community Colleges, Sacramento, California, July, 1972.

[16] Polk, Kenneth, The University and Corrections, Joint Commission on Correctional Manpower and Training, Washington, D. C., January, 1969, pp. 4-8.

[17] From unpublished report of workshop proceedings at Central States Conference on Correctional Officers Educational Program, October 30-31, 1972, St. Louis, Missouri, prepared by Carl Gerber.

[18] A Time to Act, op. cit., p. 26. The disagreement has diminished in magnitude since 1969 when the Commission report was prepared, but progress toward realistic standards will require collaboration between professional organizations and the local and state correctional agencies.

[19] Ibid., pp. 26-28.

[20] Based on unpublished data collected through a questionnaire sent to corrections specialists in state criminal justice planning.

[21] In an unpublished report of workshop proceedings at the Western States Conference on Correctional Officers Educational Program, August 28-29, 1972, Salt Lake City, Utah, prepared by J. Allen Suver, emphasis was placed on the need for broader participation in developing state plans.

[22] Based on unpublished data collected through a questionnaire sent to corrections specialists in state criminal justice planning agencies.

[23] See footnote 22.

[24] From an unpublished report of the proceedings of a workshop at the Southern States Conference on Correctional Officers Educational Program, December 14-15, 1972, Mobile, Alabama, prepared by Roger G. Worthington. Participants at the Central States Conference (footnote 17) also felt that training and education distinctions created problems in designing sound educational programs.

[25] Winkler, Karen J., "Prison Guards' Courses Periled by College-Government Rift," The Chronicle of Higher Education, Vol. VII, No. 16, p. 4, January, 1973.

[26] Beerbower, Dale T., and Anderson, Patrick R., entitled "Florida Junior College at Jacksonville Opens Criminal Justice Training and Education Center," unpublished.

[27] Pace, Denny F., et al., Law Enforcement Training and the Community College: Alternatives for Affiliation, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1970, p. 7.

[28] The Commission on Accreditation of Service Experience, American Council on Education, Washington, D. C., provides a service to military personnel, veterans, and colleges by evaluating military training and education courses and programs to determine the equivalency of such courses and programs to college credit.

[29] See footnote 12, also Korim, Andrew S. and Johnson, Jennifer, "Line Officer Educational Needs--Consensus Among Correctional and Academic Administrators." American Journal of Correction, September-October, 1972.

[30] Publications discussing linkages between community college programs and employment to provide students with integrated work experience include: Brown, Robert L., Cooperative Education, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971; Korim, Andrew S., Government Careers and the Community College, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1971; Styles, Jimmie C. and Pace, Denny F., Guidelines for Work Experience in Criminal Justice System, Washington, D. C.: American Association of Junior Colleges, 1969.

[31] Polk, op. cit., pp. 8-10.

[32] Perlman, Harvey S., Legislating for Correctional Line Officer Education and Training, American Association of Community and Junior Colleges, and the American Bar Association, Washington, D. C., 1973.

UNIVERSITY OF CALIF.
LOS ANGELES

NOV 9 1973

CLEARINGHOUSE FOR
JUNIOR COLLEGE
INFORMATION